

RECEIVED

JAN 23 1981

R. B. SELIGMAN

PHILIP MORRIS U. S. A.

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

To: . Mr. Frank Resnik  
From: . R. N. Thomson  
Subject: . Cases to be Considered for Foreign Filing

Date: January 21, 1981

Reference to: Memo from G. Inskeep, December 30, 1980

The comments concerning foreign filing by the R&D Directors and Dr. R. B. Seligman are noted below.

Case I - PM 877

APPARATUS AND METHOD FOR MOISTURE MEASUREMENT

Meyer and Thomson agree with the Patent Group's recommendation.

Osdene suggests we add Australia.

Farone feels batchwise operation is not a serious limitation and technology is available to overcome it. We should consider filing in major profit countries with significant primary/make-pack operations.

Gannon hopes that this technique could ultimately replace all OV ovens. On this basis he feels that this application (and other relevant ones) should be given very broad protection. The list should include all countries where various cigarette and component manufacturing capabilities exist.

Seligman feels if this is a basic patent for this type of moisture measurement, we should get broad coverage. If it is limited (claims) to batch analysis, the average could be narrower.

Case II - PM 807

RECONSTITUTED TOBACCO FLAVOR COMPONENT

Meyer, Seligman, Farone and Osdene agree with the Patent Group's recommendation.

Thomson feels we should delay until U.S. action is clarified.

Gannon feels the question of improved filling power is, at best, moot. No doubt valerian is a potent flavorant. Do we want to reveal the name of such an important flavorant since we cannot, and really do not, police our patents? I'm not sure I would want to see any patent issued in any country.

1003725340

Case III - PM 874

CIGARETTE WITH REDUCED CO TO TAR RATIO

Meyer, Thomson, Farone and Osdene agree with the Patent Group's recommendation.

Seligman suggests we limit filing to "co-interested" areas.

Gannon feels the title is intriguing. If it worked, I would suggest broad filing. If not, don't bother.

Case IV - PM 911B

DUAL PATH WEB TRANSPORT AND PROCESSING APPARATUS WITH RADIANT ENERGY DIRECTING MEANS

Osdene and Seligman agree with the Patent Group's recommendation.

Meyer does not understand recommendations for IV, V, VI and VII. He feels all are laser operations. Engineering recommends IV and VII file in Australia but not V and VI. Why not treat all four alike?

Thomson and Gannon agree with only Australia.

Farone agrees in principle but would recommend we check status, of loser cases in other foreign countries where we contemplate use to make sure we are either covered by a primary case or that this improvement may be negotiating tool with other laser perforators who may have patent coverage in those countries.

Case V - PM 911A

WEB TRANSPORT APPARATUS

Meyer and Farone's comments expressed in Case IV.

Thomson, Osdene, Seligman and Gannon agree with the Patent Group's recommendation.

Case VI - PM 892B

WEB MARKING APPARATUS AND METHOD

Meyer and Farone's comments expressed in Case IV.

Thomson, Osdene, Seligman and Gannon agree with the Patent Group's recommendation.

1003725341

Case VII - PM 892A

BEAM ALIGNMENT TOOL AND METHOD

Meyer's comments expressed in Case IV.

Gannon suggests Australia only.

Thomson, Farone, Osdene and Seligman agree with the Patent Group's recommendation.

Case VIII - PM 847

METHOD FOR APPLYING PARTICULATE MATTER TO TOBACCO

Meyer, Thomson and Seligman agree with the Patent Group's recommendation.

Farone agrees in principle but might wait for further evaluation before filing if allowable under patent regulation of countries involved.

Osdene agrees but wonders why Great Britain is not included.

Gannon feels the idea is reasonable. To date, it hasn't worked well at all with U.S. I'd file as recommended but be prepared to drop if it costs and we've had no success.

RNT/lmh

cc: R. B. Seligman  
W. F. Gannon  
L. F. Meyer  
T. S. Osdene  
G. E. Inskeep  
A. I. Palmer  
W. A. Farone

*RNT*

1003725342